

Remarks

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, 17-19, 21-24, 27-29, and 31-34 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 have been amended. Reconsideration of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, 17-19, 21-24, 27-29, and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,110 to Schein et al. ("Schein") in view of RD 385007A.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method for indicating a completion status of a media program, comprising:

displaying an electronic program guide (EPG) having first and second axes and a plurality of elements, the first axis corresponding to a plurality of media providers, the second axis corresponding to a plurality of time slots, each element corresponding to a media program;

displaying a line indicating a current time across at least a portion of the EPG, wherein the line is perpendicular to the second axis and bisects an element of the EPG into an elapsed portion and a remaining portion, the elapsed portion being proportional in size to an elapsed time of a media program corresponding to the element, and the remaining portion being proportional in size to a remaining time thereof;

generating a separate graph of elapsed time versus running time for a first media program when a portion of the element corresponding to the first media program cannot be displayed within the plurality of time slots currently associated with the second axis, the graph indicating the elapsed proportion of the first media program without reference to the line; and

positioning the separate graph upon the corresponding element in the EPG, the graph being automatically displayed without the necessity of user input.

Support for this amendment is found at page 17, lines 8-15 of the specification.

These claimed features allow a user, while browsing an EPG, to determine at a glance how much of a media program has been missed without having to first make a selection of an element. In many cases, the claimed line displayed across the EPG may be used for this purpose, since an element that is completely shown within the EPG may be bisected by the line, dividing the element into an elapsed portion and a remaining portion.

However, in other cases, elements representing media programs are not fully displayed in the EPG, since the EPG only represents a discrete window of time. For instance, an element representing a two-hour movie might only be partially shown within the EPG, indicating that the program will not finish within the current time window. In such situations, the line bisecting the element does not correctly indicate the elapsed proportion of the program. Indeed, in cases where the program is longer than the time period represented by the EPG window, it is not possible to scroll the EPG window to show the entire element. For example, the EPG may only provide a three-hour window, while an element may represent a four-hour sporting event. As a result, the bisecting line cannot accurately represent the proportion of elapsed time to running time.

To solve this problem, a separate graph of elapsed time versus running time is displayed upon the corresponding element (*i.e.*, the element in the EPG representing the media program) when a portion of the element corresponding to the first media program cannot be displayed within the plurality of time slots currently associated with the second axis. In other words, in those cases in which an element representing a long program (*e.g.*, Dallas v. Denver) cannot be fully shown within the

window of time represented by the EPG, a separate graph of elapsed time versus running time is displayed on that element.

In the Office Action, the Examiner apparently agreed that "Schein fails to disclose generating a separate graph of elapsed time verses running time for a first media program, the graph indicating the elapsed proportion of the first media program without reference to the line; and positioning the separate graph upon the corresponding element of the EPG." Office Action at page 3. However, the addition of RD 385007A does not cure the deficiencies of Schein. RD 385007A does not disclose or suggest that the separate graph of elapsed time verses running time is displayed when a portion of the element corresponding to the first media program cannot be displayed within the plurality of time slots currently associated with the second axis. This limitation is totally absent in both references.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct. Claims 11, 21, and 31 have been amended to include similar limitations and are likewise believed to be patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. All other claims depend directly or indirectly from one of the foregoing claims and are likewise patentably distinct by virtue of that dependency. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By



Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999